# In The United States

PAUL F. BIDGOOD,

Petitioner,

V.

TOWN OF CAVENDISH, TOWN OF CHESTER, STATE OF VERMONT AGENCY OF NATURAL RESOURCES (DEPARTMENT OF FORESTS, PARKS AND RECREATION), RICHARD SVEC and JOHN KASSEL,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE VERMONT SUPREME COURT

PETITION FOR WRIT-OF CERTIORARI
WITH APPENDIX

Paul F. Bidgood 14 Fairbanks Street West Boylston, Massachusetts 01583 (508) 835-8846

Petitioner Pro Se

#### **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

In Petitioner's underlying actions he claims numerous constitutional and federal statutory violations. After four days of trial the parties entered into a tentative Stipulation of Settlement that would have settled these claims. However, the trial court's Orders of Dismissal granted Petitioner leave to reopen within 90 days if Respondents failed to consummate the agreement within that time. On the 90th day, when Petitioner became aware of the Respondents' failure to consummate the agreement, the Petitioner mailed his request to reopen trial to the Respondents and to the court. Ultimately, the trial court, with a different judge presiding, denied Petitioner's request to reopen, basing its denial on its belief that Petitioner's request did not contain an appropriate request for court action and its belief that Petitioner's request was untimely as it was received for filing after the 90th day. As a result, even though the Respondents failed to comply with the Orders of Dismissal and the Petitioner complied with them, the Petitioner is denied from having the merits of his claims heard in contravention of the Orders of Dismissal, the strong pubic policy of deciding cases on their merits and the due process of law.

I. Is landowner's private property taken without due process of law when the trial court refuses to reopen the trial in contravention of the conditional Orders of Dismissal? II. Is landowner denied the right of free speech, right of association, right of procedural due process, right of substantive due process, right of equal protection of the laws, the right of interstate travel and the protections secured by 23 U.S.C. § 206, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1988 of his underlying claims when the trial court refuses to reopen the trial in contravention of the conditional Orders of Dismissal?

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS STATUTES AND RULES	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	13
CONCLUSION	30
APPENDIX	

#### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s) Cases Berman v. Parker, 348 U.S. 26 (1954) ......15 Bidgood v. Town of Cavendish, 2005WL1413594, 2005 VT 64, June 8, 2005 ...... 1, 22, 24, 25 Canfield Van Atta Buick/GMC Truck, Inc., 127 F.3d 248 (1997).....19 Cappillino v. Hyde Park Central School District, 135 F.3d 264 (2d Cir. 1998)......13, 28, 29 Choice Hotels International, Inc. v. Goodwin and Boone, 11 F.3d 469 (4th Cir. 1993)......13, 20, 26, 27 Derosia v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976) ......4 First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale v. County of Los Angeles, 482 U.S. 304 (1987) ......7 Fournier v. Fournier, 169 Vt. 600 (mem. 1999) ......14, 29 Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965) ......5

Hansen v. Town of Charleston,	
157 Vt. 329 (1999)	4
Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,	
467 U.S. 229 (1984)	15
Heisse v. State of Vermont,	
519 F. Supp. 36 (1980)	6
Hinesburg Sand & Gravel Co. v. Town of Hinesburg,	
135 Vt. 484 (1977)	4
Hovey v. Elliot,	
167 U.S. 409 (1897)	26
In re: 310 Associates,	
346 F.3d 31 (2003)	29
In re Cendant Corp. Prides Litigation,	
235 F.3d 176 (3rd Cir. 2000)	22
Insurance Corp of Ireland, Ltd. v.	
Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee,	
456 U.S. 694 (1982)	26
Kelo v. City of New London,	
545 U.S (2005)	15
Kinan v. Cohen,	
268 F.3d 27 (1st Cir. 2001)	13, 20
Lynch v. Household Finance Co.p.,	
405 U.S. 538 (1972)	6
Murphy v. Dep't of Taxes,	
173 Vt. 571 (mem. 2001)	22

Muze Inc. v. Digital on Demand, Inc.,	
356 F.3d 492 (2d Cir. 2004)13, 19,	27, 28
Pioneer Investment Services Co. v.	
Brunswick Associates Ltd., Assoc.,	
507 U.S. 380 (1993)13, 19,	21, 22
Saenz v. Roe,	
526 U.S. 489 (1999)	5
Sagar v. Warren Selectboard,	
170 Vt. 167 (1999)	4
SBC Enterprises, Inc. v. City of South Burlington,	
892 F. Supp. 578 (1995)	5-6
Schiavone v. Fortune,	
477 U.S. 21 (1986)	14
Societe Internationale v. Rogers,	
357 U.S. 197 (1958)	14, 26
Southview Associates, Ltd. v. Bongartz,	
980 F.2d 84 (2d Cir. 1992)	6, 7
State of Vermont v. Rivers,	
2005 VT 65	19-20
Vermont Agency of Natural Resources v. United States,	
529 U.S. 765 (2000)	17
Williamson County Regional Planning Comm'n v.	
Hamilton Bank,	
473 U.S. 172 (1985)	7
Wooley v. Maynard,	
430 U.S. 705 (1977)	4,5

## **Constitutional Provisions**

U.S. CONST. A. 1. I.	passim
U.S. CONST. Amend. V	passim
U.S. CONST. Amend. XIV	passim
Right to interstate travel	passim
Federal Statutes	
23 U.S.C. § 206	i, 10, 16
23 U.S.C. § 206(g)(1)	1, 11
23 U.S.C. § 206(h)(4)(A)	1, 11
23 U.S.C. § 206(h)(4)(B)	1, 11
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	1
42 U.S.C. § 1983	1, 4, 16
42 U.S.C. § 1988ii,	1, 4, 16
Vermont Statutes	
10 V.S.A. § 441(c)	), 11, 16
19 V.S.A. § 743	4
23 V.S.A. § 3201(7)	1, 5
23 V.S.A. § 3202(a)	1, 5

# Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(c)
Fed. R. Civ. P. 34
Fed. R. Civ. P. 41
Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(2)20, 25, 26
Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)
Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)
Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6)
Vermont Rules of Civil Procedure
V.R.C.P. 1
V.R.C.P. 3
V.R.C.P. 5(b)
V.R.C.P. 5(e)
V.R.C.P. 6(a)
V.R.C.P. 6(e)
V.R.C.P. 59(e)
V.R.C.P. 60(b)
V.R.C.P. 60(b)(1)
V.R.C.P. 60(b)(6)

## Other Authorities

10A E. McQuillin, The Law of Municipal	
Corporations § 30.63 (3d ed. 1999)	15
Black River Tribune, January 15, 2003	17
Black River Tribune, February 25, 2004	17
Black River Tribune, March 31, 2004	19
History of Captain John Kathan, David Mansfield, 1902	2
Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation in the United States,	
Regions and States, United States Department of	
Agriculture, June 2005	16
Rutland Herald, August 29, 2005	16
Rutland Herald, January 19, 2002	17
Rutland Herald, January 18, 2002	17
Rutland Herald, December 1, 2001	17
Rutland Herald, November 6, 2001	17

#### **OPINIONS BELOW**

The OPINION of the Vermont Supreme Court appears in the Appendix at 1a-12a and is reported at *Bidgood v. Town of Cavendish*, -A.2d -, 2005WL1413594, 2005 VT 64, June 8, 2005.

## **JURISDICTION**

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was June 8, 2005. A copy of that decision appears in the Appendix at 1a-12a.

A timely motion for reargument was thereafter denied on July 12, 2005, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears in the Appendix at 14a.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

### CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES AND RULES

Procedural Matters	
V.R.C.P. 1	Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)
V.R.C.P. 3	Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6)
V.R.C.P. 5(b)	
V.R.C.P. 5(e)	
V.R.C.P. 6(a)	
V.R.C.P. 6(e)	
V.R.C.P. 59(e)	
V.R.C.P. 60(b)(1)	
V.R.C.P. 60(b)(6)	
Substantive Matters	*
10 V.S.A. § 441(c)	42 U.S.C. § 1983
23 V.S.A. § 3201(7)	42 U.S.C. § 1988
23 V.S.A. § 3202(a)	First Amendment
23 U.S.C. § 206(g)(1)	Fifth Amendment
23 U.S.C. § 206(h)(4)(A)	Fourteenth Amendment
23 U.S.C. § 206(h)(4)(B)	Right to interstate travel

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner owns the very corner lot in the southwest corner of Cavendish and an adjacent parcel in the neighboring Town of Chester, both parcels are situated near the summit of Bailey Hill. This land was first settled by the Petitioner's ancestors in the early 1800's and purchased back into the Petitioner's family in 1993.1 Petitioner plans to build a house, reestablish the family farm and to reside in Vermont. There is no Town of Chester public highway that provides access to Petitioner's Chester land. There is only one public highway that provides vehicular access to Petitioner's Cavendish property and it is class 3 Cavendish Town Highway No. 36, Old Bailey Hill Road. Petitioner's Cavendish land abuts this highway, yet he is unable to travel on this highway by passenger car to access his land during the winter season in Vermont from approximately mid-November to mid-May because the Respondent, Town of Cavendish (Cavendish) in contravention of mandatory law does not plow snow off this highway and the Vermont Association of Snow Travelers, Inc. (VAST), under the direction of Respondents Cavendish, the Agency of Natural Resources (Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation) (ANR) and the Town of Chester (Chester), in contravention of Vermont and federal law, have located a recreational snowmobile trail upon this highway and along the section of this highway located in the Proctor Piper State Forest

While Petitioner is currently a resident of Massachusetts, his roots in Vermont are deep and he is fighting the Respondents' efforts to chase him out of Vermont. Stephen Stoddard (Petitioner's great-great